

REMARKS

In the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application and bringing closure to the prosecution of the present application, applicant has cancelled Claims 1-25, and submits the following arguments regarding the patentability of Claim 26. Since Claim 26 was previously amended and the following arguments relate solely to the patentability of Claim 26, applicant contends that the present response would not require any new search and/or consideration.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moses et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,442,688), in view of Geiger (U.S. Patent No.: 6,434,536), in view of Arledge et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,561,703), and further in view of Turnbull et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,092,201). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection.

In the latest action, the Examiner responds to applicant's arguments regarding Claim 26 by adding Turnbull to the proposed combination, as well as reiterating the Examiner's previous arguments regarding Moses. Applicant contends that the application of the Examiner's proposed combination to Claim 26 is still deficient.

For example, after being unable to identify limitations in Geiger, the Examiner relies on col. 8, lines 16-47 of Turnbull to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "the frequency in which the user is notified, including every month, every week, every day, and every minute." The Examiner further states that Turnbull discloses "periodic updates of shared certificates update notifications."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion, since Turnbull merely suggests periodic "verifications" and "updates" (in the context of updating data by "modifying a list"), not notifications, as claimed by applicant. Moreover, it is noted that simply nowhere is there any "plurality of drop down menus each associated with one of the terms ... the terms including: the frequency in which the user is notified," as specifically claimed.

More importantly, the Examiner relies on the following excerpt from Moses to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "the type of change the user is notified of in the step of notifying, including the revocation of, the roll-over of, the change in field of, the disablement of, and the expiration of the electronic certificate."

"The process then proceeds to step 82 where the user determines newly updated public key certificates based on the indication. The indication of the newly updated public key certificates may be received as a new public key certificate for the subscriber subject, a revocation of a public key certificate of the subscriber subject, or a change to the public key certificate of the subscriber subject." (col. 6, lines 43-48)

The Examiner further admits that applicant's specifically claimed changes (see above) "are not explicitly stated" and then notes "that these changes are exactly the types of changes that occur in electronic certificate updates."

Since the Examiner has admitted that Moses is explicitly lacking, it thus appears that the Examiner is making an *inherency* argument. Specifically, it appears that the Examiner is arguing that applicant's specific claimed combination of changes (see above) is inherent in Moses, since Moses discloses "electronic certificate updates."

This is simply improper. Just because Moses suggests "electronic certificate updates," Moses does not necessarily suggest the specific type of updates claimed by applicant. In fact, by specifically calling out "updated," "revocation," and "change"-related updates (see excerpt above), it is clear that Moses contemplated the specific type of updates that were to be included and, in doing so, failed to include applicant's claimed "type of change the user is notified of in the step of notifying, including the revocation of, the roll-over of, the change in field of, the disablement of, and the expiration of the electronic certificate."

Only applicant teaches and claims such specific updates which provide a more comprehensive notification of possible changes to an electronic certificate by notifying a user of “the roll-over of, the change in field of, the disablement of, and the expiration of the electronic certificate.” Simply nowhere in the prior art is there such a combination of features and components for fulfilling the foregoing objectives.

Applicant has thus adequately rebutted the Examiner’s *inherency* argument with the above showing that the foregoing novel features would be unobvious in view of the proposed combination. Therefore, the foregoing novel features of applicant’s claims are not inherent in Moses and, for the reasons set forth hereinabove, are patentable.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant’s disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Applicant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has clearly not been met since, as set forth above, the combined references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

A notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the

Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAIIP068).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka  
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172-1120  
408-505-5100